



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/035,039	12/28/2001	Brian K. Classon	CR00312M(72464)	9174
22242	7590	07/26/2005	EXAMINER	
FITCH EVEN TABIN AND FLANNERY 120 SOUTH LA SALLE STREET SUITE 1600 CHICAGO, IL 60603-3406			TRAN, KHANH C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2631	

DATE MAILED: 07/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/035,039

Applicant(s)

CLASSON ET AL.

Examiner

Khanh Tran

Art Unit

2631

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 February 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 and 14-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 and 14-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The Amendment filed on 02/15/2005. Claims 1-12, 14-38 are pending in this Office action.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3, 16, 18, 21 and 27 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-12, 14-21, 25-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamalainen et al. U.S. Patent 6,289,217 B1 in view of Walton et al. U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US2003/0086371 A1.

Regarding claims 1, 14 and 28, Hamalainen invention is directed to a radio connection adapted to an environment changing over the connection in a cellular radio system where the radio traffic between the base station and the mobile stations is

Art Unit: 2631

arranged on a multiple access principle. Figure 3 illustrates a retransmission as part of a method according to Hamalainen invention.

Referring to figure 3, in column 9 lines 10-45, for transmission, the source data is according to mode 301 subjected to channel coding and interleaving so that a given data sequence is interleaved for the duration of a relatively short period (usually 2-8 bursts, 4 bursts shown in figure 3). The foregoing step corresponds to the claimed step of providing data to be transmitted.

The transmission of bursts is represented by modes 302, 303, 304 and 305. The receiving device tries, in modes 306, 307, 308, and 309, to decode the data sequence after each received burst and sends, along with the acknowledgement, a message of the success or failing of the decoding for the transmitting device. The transmitting device sends the next burst connected to the data sequence if the receiving device has not correctly decoded the data sequence. Hence, the receiving device determines if the burst is correctly decodable. That step corresponds to the claimed step of "determining whether likely trustworthy channel quality data is obtainable. In making the rejection, decodable burst is equated to the claimed likely trustworthy channel quality data.

If the receiving device does not successfully decode the burst, the transmitting device sends the next burst connected to the data sequence. In view of that, the foregoing step corresponds to the claimed step of "when likely trustworthy channel quality data is not obtainable, determine whether to transmit at least a portion of the data pursuant to a first transmission selection mode".

Referring to figure 1, when all bursts belonging to one interleaving period are received, as disclosed in figure 3, the receiver determines whether the value of the function Q describing the connection quality is higher than the threshold value Q_{th} , see column 5 lines 13-23. If the connection quality is higher than the threshold value, the size of data transmission capacity reserved for the radio connection in the frame structure is reduced, so that the transmitting device must decrease the coding rate, change the coding type or increase the modulation order in order to make all data being transmitted to fit in the reserved capacity, see column 3 line 62 via column 4 line 16. AS result of that, if the connection quality is higher than the threshold value, likely trustworthy channel quality data is obtainable as appreciated by a person of average skill in the art. Hamalainen et al. does not expressly teach the claimed step of when likely trustworthy channel quality data is obtainable, at least attempting to obtain channel quality data. However, in real time mode, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the receiving device keep receiving channel quality data because the transmitting device continue transmit data (no pause) until a request for reducing the capacity reserved for the connection between the base station and the mobile station. The foregoing step corresponds to the claimed "at least attempting to obtain channel quality data when likely trustworthy channel quality data is obtainable".

As recited above, if the connection quality is higher than the threshold value, the size of data transmission capacity reserved for the radio connection in the frame structure is reduced, so that the transmitting device must decrease the coding rate,

change the coding type or increase the modulation order in order to make all data being transmitted to fit in the reserved capacity. In light of the foregoing, using the channel quality data, the transmitting device selects a second transmission mode (e.g. by decreasing the coding rate, changing the coding type or increasing the modulation order) for transmitting data. Hence, the foregoing step corresponds to the claimed step “whether channel quality data is obtained, using the channel quality data to determine how to transmit at least a portion of the data pursuant to a second transmission mode”.

Hamalainen et al. does not teach “wherein using the channel quality data to determine whether, how, and when to transmit at least a portion of the data pursuant to a second transmission selective mode includes selecting at least one particular carrier from amongst a plurality of candidate carriers” as claimed in the application claim.

Walton et al. invention is directed to techniques to adaptively control the rate of a data transmission in wireless (e.g. OFDM) communication system. Various types of metrics relate to different characteristic of the communication channel; see paragraphs [0010] and [0011]. In paragraph [0089], various types of metrics may be used in different manners to adaptively control the rate of a data transmission. In paragraph [0100], depending on the channel response, all or only a subset of the available frequency subchannels may be selected for use. The foregoing underlined disclosure corresponds to the claimed “selecting at least one particular carrier from amongst a plurality of candidate carriers”. Hamalainen et al. and Walton et al. teachings are in the same field of endeavor. Hamalainen et al. radio link adaptation takes place on the basis of the connection quality, wherein the connection quality can be based on carrier to

Art Unit: 2631

interference ratio (C/I ratio). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that Hamalainen et al. radio link adaptation can be modified to implement Walton et al. teachings of depending on the channel response, all or only a subset of the available frequency subchannels may be selected for use. Motivation is that according to Hamalainen et al. teachings, the C/I ratio determines the connection quality, and hence, if the connection quality degrades, select other carriers would improve the connection quality.

Regarding claim 2, as disclosed in column 2 line 66 via column 3 line 7, the connection quality includes data transmission rate, bit error ratio and fluctuations within minimum and maximum values. Hence, in real time mode, the bit error ratio would determine whether the channel quality data is likely accurate at a time when used as claimed in the instant application.

Regarding claim 3, in column 10 lines 20-32, Hamalainen discloses an example of applying higher order modulation method using QPSK. In QPSK modulation, the I and Q components are representative of subcarriers. Hence, using analogous argument of claim 2, in real time mode, the bit error ratio would determine whether the channel quality data is likely accurate at a time when used for each of subcarriers as claimed in the instant application.

Regarding claim 4, according to Walton et al. teachings, in paragraphs [0068] and [0069], metrics Related to Time Selectivity (TS Metrics) [0069] Time selectivity of a communication channel may be quantified by coherence time in the time domain or a corresponding Doppler spread in the frequency domain. In paragraph [0078], to estimate the coherence time of the communication channel in a frequency division duplex system, the transmitter can send a pilot (e.g., a pilot symbol comprised of a constant amplitude tone in each frequency sub-channel).

Regarding claim 5, in paragraph [00699], Walton teaches that Time selectivity of a communication channel may be quantified by coherence time in the time domain or a corresponding Doppler spread in the frequency domain. Coherence time is a measure of the duration over which the channel can be expected not to change appreciably. In the frequency domain, this may be measured by a Doppler spectrum associated with the channel, with the width of the Doppler spectrum being inversely proportional to the channel's coherence time.

Regarding claim 6, Hamalainen et al. and Walton et al. teachings apply to fading channel, which is a memory channel requiring accessing previously acquired data.

Regarding claim 7, Hamalainen et al. and Walton et al. teachings are adaptive. Therefore, it requires acquisition of new data to update the channel estimate.

Regarding claims 8 and 11-12, as recited in claim 5, Walton teaches that Time selectivity of a communication channel may be quantified by coherence time in the time domain or a corresponding Doppler spread in the frequency domain. Coherence time is a measure of the duration over which the channel can be expected not to change appreciably.

Regarding claim 9, as recited in claim 4, in paragraph [0078], to estimate the coherence time of the communication channel in a frequency division duplex system, the transmitter can send a pilot (e.g., a pilot symbol comprised of a constant amplitude tone in each frequency sub-channel).

Regarding claim 10, in paragraph [0060], to estimate the coherence bandwidth of the communication channel in an FDD system, the transmitter can send a pilot. In an OFDM system, a pilot symbol comprised of a constant amplitude tone in each of the available frequency subchannels may be sent.

Regarding claim 15, as recited above, if the connection quality is higher than the threshold value, the size of data transmission capacity reserved for the radio connection in the frame structure is reduced, so that the transmitting device must decrease the coding rate, change the coding type or increase the modulation order in order to make all data being transmitted to fit in the reserved capacity. In light of the foregoing, using the channel quality data, the transmitting device selects a second transmission mode

Art Unit: 2631.

(e.g. by decreasing the coding rate, changing the coding type or increasing the modulation order) for transmitting data. Because the size of data transmission capacity reserved for the radio connection in the frame structure is reduced, the transmitting device does not transmit a portion of the data.

Regarding claim 16, claim 16 is rejected on the same ground as for claim 1. Furthermore, if the connection quality is higher than the threshold value, the size of data transmission capacity reserved for the radio connection in the frame structure is reduced, so that the transmitting device must decrease the coding rate, change the coding type or increase the modulation order in order to make all data being transmitted to fit in the reserved capacity. In light of the foregoing, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art that decreasing the coding rate, changing the coding type corresponds to selection of a coding scheme from among a plurality of candidate coding scheme. Hamalainen et al. further teaches utilization one of higher order modulation schemes such as BPSK, QPSK, which corresponds to the claimed selection of a modulation scheme.

Regarding claim 17, as recited in claim 1, Walton et al. invention is directed to techniques to adaptively control the rate of a data transmission in wireless (e.g. OFDM) communication system. Various types of metrics relate to different characteristic of the communication channel; see paragraphs [0010] and [0011]. In paragraph [0089], various types of metrics may be used in different manners to adaptively control the rate

Art Unit: 2631

of a data transmission. In paragraph [0100], depending on the channel response, all or only a subset of the available frequency subchannels may be selected for use.

Regarding claim 18, claim 18 is rejected on the same ground as for claim 16 because of similar scope. The only difference between claim 16 and claim 18 is that the selection of a particular modulation and coding scheme is for the first transmission selection mode in claim 18.

Regarding claim 19, in paragraph [0104], Walton et al. teaches that the interleaving provides time diversity for the coded bits, permits the data to be transmitted based on an average SNR for the frequency subchannels used for the data transmission, combats fading, and further removes correlation between coded bits used to form each modulation symbol.

Regarding claim 20, claim 20 is rejected on the same ground as for claim 1 because of similar scope. Furthermore, according to Hamalainen et al. teachings, if the connection quality is higher than the threshold value, the size of data transmission capacity reserved for the radio connection in the frame structure is reduced, so that the transmitting device must decrease the coding rate, change the coding type or increase the modulation order in order to make all data being transmitted to fit in the reserved capacity. In light of the foregoing teachings, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that Hamalainen et al. teachings can

Art Unit: 2631

be modified to have different modulation and different coding scheme when the frame structure is reduced. Motivation is the size of data transmission capacity reserved for the radio connection in the frame structure is reduced.

Regarding claim 21, referring to figure 3 of Hamalainen et al. invention, for each burst transmitted from the transmitting device, the receiving device response with a positive including channel quality data. The receiving device corresponds to the transmission target.

Regarding claim 25, claim 25 is rejected on the same ground as for claim 1 because of similar scope. Furthermore, in column 3, lines 44-55, according to Hamalainen et al. invention in one embodiment, the radio link adaptation taking place after the bearer setup is carried out in a somewhat different procedure depending on whether we are talking about a real-time (RT) or non-real-time (NRT) data transmission. Real-time data transmission is often called delay-critical data transmission, and for an RT bearer there is typically reserved in the frame structure a given slot or slots that are repeated from frame to frame in equal size.

Regarding claims 26-27, as recited in claim 1, if the connection quality is higher than the threshold value, the size of data transmission capacity reserved for the radio connection in the frame structure is reduced, so that the transmitting device must decrease the coding rate, change the coding type or increase the modulation order in

Art Unit: 2631

order to make all data being transmitted to fit in the reserved capacity. Hence, the step of the transmitting device decreasing the coding rate, changing the coding type would correspond to the claimed step of whether the transmitter use. In light of the foregoing, using the channel quality data, the transmitting device selects a second transmission mode (e.g. by decreasing the coding rate, changing the coding type or increasing the modulation order) for transmitting data as receiving a request for reducing the capacity.

Regarding claim 29, claim 29 is rejected on the same ground as for claim 1 and further in view of claim 20 because of similar scope.

Regarding claim 30, claim 30 is rejected on the same ground as for claim 1 because of similar scope. Furthermore, referring to column 3, lines 5-15 of Hamalainen et al. invention, multiple function mobile stations can simultaneously maintain several bearers that combine the mobile station to one or several base stations.

Regarding claim 31, referring to Walton et al. invention, in paragraph [0035], the SNR may be determined at the receiver for each group of transmission channels (e.g., frequency subchannels) to be individually processed (e.g., coded and modulated).

Regarding claim 32, referring to Walton et al. invention, in paragraph [0035], the SNR can be determined at the receiver for each group of transmission channels, e.g. frequency sub-channels, to be individually processed. Hence, the fore going teachings

Art Unit: 2631

address the claimed limitation "*at least attempting to obtain the corresponding channel quality data for each of a plurality of candidate carriers*".

Regarding claim 33, referring to Walton et al. invention, in paragraphs [0035] [0036], a rate selector 166 receives the channel metrics from channel estimator 162 and performance metrics from demodulator/decoder 164 and, based on the received metrics, determines a suitable "rate" that may be used for all or a subset of the transmission channels available for use for data transmissions, e.g. the frequency sub-channels of an OFDM system.

Regarding claim 34, as recited in claim 33, a rate selector 166 receives the channel metrics from channel estimator 162 and performance metrics from demodulator/decoder 164 and, based on the received metrics, determines a suitable "rate" that may be used for all or a subset of the transmission channels available for use for data transmissions, e.g. the frequency sub-channels of an OFDM system.

4. Claims 22-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamalainen et al. U.S. Patent 6,289,217 B1 and Walton et al. U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US2003/0086371 A1 as applied to claim 21 above, and further in view of McFarland U.S. Patent Application Publication US2002/0006167 A1.

Regarding claim 22, Hamalainen and Walton et al. do not teach wherein transmitting a signal to the transmission target includes transmitting a fast

sounding channel evaluation signal such that the transmission target can evaluate a time-frequency response of the multi-carrier domain as claimed in the application claim.

McFarland invention is directed to provide a multi-carrier system in which the number of carriers, the symbol rate, and thereby the overall occupied bandwidth can be varied; see paragraph [0015]. In paragraphs [0049] [0050], the best operating mode could be based on a trial "sounding" of the communications channel. The transmitter would send out a special signal (e.g., a reference signal having constant and known phase/magnitude characteristics that can be easily observed) or packet of information. The receiver would analyze this signal to determine the quality of the channel. Factors would include the multi-path delay as well as the total available bandwidth. These observations would be sent back to the original transmitter, presumably using a very robust mode of transmission, or at least a mode of transmission that is receivable for the channel in question. At this point, both nodes will be aware of the channel conditions. Hamalainen, Walton et al. and McFarland are in the same field of endeavor. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that Hamalainen and Walton et al. teachings can be modified to include McFarland teachings. Motivation is that Hamalainen teachings measure the connection quality and Walton et al. teachings determine various types of metrics.

Regarding claims 23-24, as recited in claim 22, the receiver would analyze this signal to determine the quality of the channel. Factors would include the multi-path delay as well as the total available bandwidth. These observations would be sent back to the original transmitter, presumably using a very robust mode of transmission.

5. Claims 35-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walton et al. U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US2003/0086371 A1.

Regarding claim 35, in paragraph [0089], Walton et al. teaches various types of metrics can be used in different manners to adaptively control the rate of a data transmission. In paragraph [0090],

In paragraph [0109], see also figure 3, the receiver monitors the transmitted pilot symbols and derived various types of channel metrics including channel coherence time (or Doppler spread), the total SNR as the ratio of the total received signal power to the total noise power at the receiver. The SNR may be determined at various points along the signal processing path at the receiver. Based on various types of metrics, controller 370 may determine or select new rate for the data transmission. Control information in the form of selected rate or the metrics themselves and transmitted by a transmitter 354 back to transmitter system 110a.

Walton et al. does not expressly teach the claimed limitation "when the channel coherence time indicates the multi-carrier channel is changing too quickly,".

In paragraph [0092], if the frame error rate is high, then a rate reduction request results. The frame error rate is directly related to the channel metrics. Because the receiver (mobile unit) transmits back the control information in the form of selected rate or the metrics themselves to the transmitter, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that the feedback control information can be modified to send back the channel coherence time status and the total SNR as the ratio of the total received signal power to the total noise power at the receiver.

Similarly, in paragraph [0094], if the new rate does not indicate a rate increase, but the data transmission remains error free over some particular time duration, then a rate increase request may also result. "The new rate does not indicate a rate increase" corresponds to the claimed "when the channel coherence time does not indicate that the multi-carrier channel is change too quickly". Because the receiver (mobile unit) transmits back the control information in the form of selected rate or the metrics themselves to the transmitter, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that the feedback control information can be modified to send back the channel coherence time status and the total SNR as the ratio of the total received signal power to the total noise power at the receiver.

Regarding claim 36, Walton et al. does not teach measuring the speed of movement of the mobile communications system as claimed. However, because the

Art Unit: 2631

rate of change of channel is also directly related to the speed of movement of the mobile communications system, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that Walton et al. channel metrics can be modified to include measuring the speed of movement of the mobile communications system.

Regarding claim 37, in paragraph [0069], coherence time is represented by a Doppler Spectrum associated with the channel, with the width of the Doppler Spectrum being inversely proportional to the channel's coherence time.

Regarding claim 38, as discussed in paragraph [0069], coherence time is also measured by a Doppler spectrum associated with the channel. Doppler spread is a measure of the dispersion in the frequency domain caused by time variability of the channel. In view of the foregoing disclosure, measuring of the dispersion in the frequency domain caused by time variability of the channel corresponds to the claimed "comparing channel frequency response as determined at differing times".

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Khanh Tran whose telephone number is 571-272-3007. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 08:00 AM - 05:00 PM.

Art Unit: 2631

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mohammad Ghayour can be reached on 571-272-3021. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KCT

Khánh Cong Tran

07/22/2005

Examiner KHANH TRAN